

10. C. 4

6

THE SUPREMACY OF SEX

AND

AN AUTO DA FE AT THE DAWN OF THE
TWENTIETH CENTURY.



"I regard Sex as the central problem of life, and the question of Sex stands before the coming generations as the chief problem for solution. Sex lies at the root of life, and we can never learn to reverence life until we know how to understand sex."—HAVELOCK ELLIS.



THE SUPREMACY OF SEX.

A CERTAIN class of theologians has, during recent times, been busy at the delectable labour of transforming the legends of the Scriptures into allegories. This is not the place wherein to admire the feats of intellectual skill they perform, or to regret the waste of mental energy entailed in making fables doubly fabulous. But in one case at least the search after allegory is amply rewarded. The legend of the Garden of Eden, regarded as an allegory, contains a fundamental truth of human life. The career of humanity began with the first kiss under the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; all the joys and sorrows of our mortal life may be traced back to that ancestral embrace. "There," says the theologian, "was the origin of original sin, the fountainhead of all the iniquity that pollutes the blood of God's people." "There," says the poet, "the first note of human joy was sounded. All the glories of the lost Eden was as nothing to the passionate happiness of that primal love." These antagonistic views have only one point of agreement. They are both alike in ascribing to love a power of the first magnitude. Both the theologian and the poet (the one unwittingly and the other deliberately) give their fervent testimony to the supremacy of sex.

The man of science has, it would seem, been slow in acknowledging what the theologian lugubriously proclaimed and the poet exultingly sang centuries ago. For generations the whole realm of sex was to the man of science

a thing apart from the ordinary world of life, a thing to be studied, no doubt, but nevertheless a thing difficult to correlate with the other "ologies" in his mental catalogue. The authors of "The Evolution of Sex" incidentally complain of the habit among scientific men of looking upon the reproductive processes not as part and parcel of general vital activity, but as something exceptional and apart. In this respect men of science lead, or are led by, the average man, who likewise has a separate compartment in his mind for sexual questions. Both classes are only gradually reaching the truth that sex is not only inseparable from the every-day processes of life, but that it is their central fact. Without it, these processes would be meaningless, abortive. If there is anything which the revelations of science have brought home to us it is that in the world of living beings the laws of sex are at once the most fundamental and the most imperative.

While we are taking men of science to task for neglecting to recognise the supremacy of sex, it would be unfair to let philosophers escape a like castigation. The transcendentalism which is so prominent a feature in orthodox philosophies, has prevented a clear appreciation of the part which the sex principle plays in nature, and principally in human nature. Philosophers seemed inclined to touch the subject of sex with gloved hands, and their metaphysical systems are as carefully emasculated as the most fastidious could wish. Only in recent materialistic systems (those which are plainly destined to supersede the pseudo-scientific philosophies of the past) only in these do we find the sex principle accorded a definite place in the scheme of things. The mode of reasoning in such cases is something as follows:—The phenomena of sex form an integral part in the life of the higher organisms. Descending the scale of

evolution, we can trace these phenomena in ever-increasing simplicity until, in the lowest animals, we have nothing but two "exhausted cells which flow together in incipient sexual union."^{*} Below that stage, sex in its accepted manifestations disappears; but, according to the evolutionary view, the protoplasmic substance must itself possess those potentialities which at a later stage of development emerge in the actualities of sexual reproduction. Going still further back, and remembering that the evolutionist admits no gulf between the "living" and the "non-living," it becomes clear that not only in protoplasm but in the matter from which it was evolved, we may look for those same potentialities of sex. In other words, inorganic matter must possess certain properties which have enabled it, in the course of evolution into organic matter, to produce the phenomena of sex.

To those who are accustomed to carry the theory of evolution to its logical end, such a conclusion may seem startling. Surely, it is urged, matter alone cannot contain the potentialities of so complex and marvellous a world as that of sex. But neither a superstitious awe at the wonders of nature nor a tendency (theologically inspired) to depreciate the potentialities of matter should be allowed to blind the mind to the fact that, as Tyndall said in effect, "matter contains the potentialities of all things." That is the basal creed of modern science, the outcome of all our knowledge of nature. However, in the special subject of sex, there are certain properties of matter which render the acceptance of this materialistic creed a fairly easy thing. A clear and concise exposition of these will be found in *From Matter to Man*, by A. Redcote Dewar—a book which, if occasionally a little impatient with the out-of-date theologian, is full

^{*} *The Evolution of Sex*, p. 236.

of sound and earnest thought. Mr. Dewar affirms that there is a duality of matter which may, without any serious stretch of language, be called a *sexuality*.

The atoms of matter may, as everyone acquainted with chemistry knows, be divided into two great classes—metallic and non-metallic. Every chemical compound contains these two classes in combination; it is reciprocal action between members of the different classes that effects the combination. A union productive of a new substance is impossible between members of the same class. The sexual analogy is, therefore, clear, and Mr. Dewar arrives at the conclusion that “matter itself must be sexual.” This does not mean, however, that one class of atoms can be called male and the other female. “What is implied by material sexuality is solely a *reciprocal duality* in fundamentals, which produces disparity in compounds.”

The author then goes on to show how this reciprocal duality of matter (the fact is indisputable, whether we agree to apply the term *sexual* to it or not) is the basis of sex in organisms.

“The origin of sex,” he says, after discussing sex in vegetals, “thus needs no lengthy argument. It indubitably arises from the fundamental duality or sexuality of primary matter itself. The atoms are themselves dual—metallic and non-metallic. From the affinities of these two classes of atoms the gradually increasing complexity of sexual mechanism and action may be traced, from the simple union of oxygen and hydrogen into water, to the fertilisation of the vegetal female ovule by the protoplasm of a male pollen grain. Again, although sex in the higher organisms seems chiefly a differentiation in form, yet fundamentally its action, as in impregnation, is solely a chemical process; hence, if we traced all the phenomena of vegetal reproduction from conjugation in algae to cross-fertilisation in orchids, the fundamental function of sex in each and all would only resolve itself into a chemical or sexual union of dually reciprocal elements.”

It is impossible, of course, to do more than hint at the mass of corroborative evidence brought forward by Mr.

Dewar in favour of his theory ; but enough has perhaps been said to show that if we look to matter to give us the basis of sexuality as we familiarly know it, we do not look in vain. The real interest of Mr. Dewar's conclusion, from the point of view of the present discussion, lies in the light it throws on the source of the supremacy of sex. If the very atoms of which we and the world are composed obey laws which are repeated in the highest manifestations of the sexual life, the dominance of the sex principle is inevitable. We can no more get away from sex than we can from the atoms that compose us. The poet's line—

“Nothing in the world is single,”

is true in a far deeper sense than ever the author intended. In the clash of atoms is found the first fore-shadowing of that marvellous reciprocal attraction which has, above all other forces internal and external, made our world what it is.

Having thus given sex an ultimate atomic origin, it is almost superfluous to affirm that throughout the whole range of nature we shall find evidences of sexual activity varying in complexity with the development of organisms. In the lower animals and in plants, of course, sexual manifestations possess only the rudiments of those psychological qualities which give sexual attraction the name of love. It is not only a mere delicacy of taste that refuses to apply to the union of simple male and female cells the name of love. Love, in other words, is not mere “protoplasmic hunger,” and any discussion of the supremacy of sex among higher animals must take account of the part played by the psychical as well as the physical side of the organism. But it must be remembered that the psychical element in love is no addition from an extraneous source. It is merely a natural evolutionary development, a concomitant of nerve

structure which needs no appeal to a creative fiat to explain its existence. The nervous system of man is recognised to be a product of evolution: the psychical manifestations of sex are merely a function of that system.

This mode of treating the origin and evolution of sex will prepare the way to the doctrine that, in the highest as well as in the lowest animals, sex involves the whole organism* and not merely the special organs of reproduction. In the case of most "brutes," and even in man himself, sexologists have frequently placed the seat of inter-sexual attraction in the activity of the sexual organs alone. It is this theory which induces people to see in "the hunger of the sex cells" the prime mover of sexual life. But, while it would be absurd to minimise the important part which the sex organs play in even the highest forms of love, it is a narrow view which sees in these organs the one and only centre of sexual activity. There are other bodily functions which play an integral part in the origin and growth of love, functions apart from the elaboration of reproductive material on the one hand, and from the higher psychical activities on the other.

As this matter is one of vital importance from the point of view of our special subject, it merits careful attention. If "the sexual need in all its forms, from the brute desire of copulation up to the most delicate manifestations of love," is ultimately, "nothing else than" the activity of an "organ which requires to function, of seminal vessels which require to discharge themselves," certain physiological consequences are clearly necessary. As M. Roux points out in his excellent book on *La Psychologie de l'Instinct Sexuel*, (from which the previous words are taken):—

"if the basis of the sexual instinct is only a fundamental need on the part of the genital organs, it could never appear when these are not capable of functioning (castration before puberty); it must disappear

when the genital organs are organically or functionally suppressed (castration, the menopause, diseases, etc.). Finally, the sexual need must entirely disappear when it is organically satisfied by coitus."

Now, the facts of the sexual life do not, as M. Roux clearly shows, and as will be evident to all who have given the subject some study, accord with these inevitable consequences of the theory that the sole centre of sexuality is in the genital organs. Therefore the theory must be false in one or more respects. We need only call to mind the commonplace fact that "coitus, the satisfaction demanded by the genital organs, is far from always satisfying the sexual need at the same time; that the latter often still exists, even when the genital organs demand nothing more": we need only call this to mind to see that we must look to the bodily system *as a whole* for the seat of that sexual attraction which is at once so imperative and so insatiable.

Support is given to this view by the close bonds which exist between visual, olfactory, auditory, and tactile sensations and the excitement of the genital sense. The physiology of sex is full of instances of the stimulus given to sexual excitement by sights, sounds, and particular contacts. And these involve the general nervous system. If we seek for any special nerve system which might be the mechanism of the sexual life, we do not find it. "It is almost certain that this nervous impression [that which gives rise to reflexes involving the organs of generation] has no special conductors, and simply follows the nerves of general sensibility." In other words, not only is the general nervous system the mechanism of manifestations of sex, but the senses of hearing, sight, touch, and smell all contribute to intensify the needs which find their physical outcome in copulation. To quote M. Roux once more:—

"The rôle of the sensations derived from the genital organs should

not therefore be denied, it should be restricted. Tarehanoff removing the seminal vessels of frogs, the veterinary or other surgeon practising the ablation of the genital organs, only suppress one of the elements of sexuality, and, we may even add, the least important. The tremendous, the irresistible force which urges the sexes towards each other has its source elsewhere; it takes its root in our entire organism, in the utmost depths of our being. *We love with our whole body.* Not one of our anatomical elements is independent of the functions of reproduction."

The supremacy of sex is merely a corollary from this view of its mechanism. And although some critics may quarrel with its materialistic basis, the truth of the theory seems, with our present scientific knowledge, indubitable. It may assist the "idealist" in accepting it if we consider how the higher psychic functions of the human organism, those lofty thoughts and feelings, which are popularly supposed to place us on an utterly different plane from our ancestors the brutes, lend their combined aid in reinforcing the sexual attraction which arises from our "lower" anatomical needs.

As regards this aspect of the matter, one cannot do better than refer to Herbert Spencer's well-known analysis of the passion which unites the sexes. He looks upon its *complexity* as the source of its strength; "it is the most compound, and therefore the most powerful, of all the feelings." The elements which compose it are the attractions associated with purely physiological wants, personal beauty, exalted "affection," admiration, reverence, love of approbation, self-esteem, pleasure of possession, mutual liberty of thought and action, exalted sympathies.

"These," says Spenceer, "all greatly exalted, and severally tending to reflect their excitements on one another, unite to form the mental state we call love . . . this passion fuses into one immense aggregate most of the elementary excitations of which we are capable; and hence results its irresistible power."

This analysis points to the psychic complexity of love as the basis of the supremacy of sex. Physical attraction is

certainly an element, but, according to Herbert Spencer, only one of a crowd. It is interesting to note that M. Roux here joins issue with Spencer. Love, he says, does not draw its irresistible power "from the complexity of the feelings which enter into play. Only organic needs could acquire such irresistibility." The higher feelings therefore appear merely as adjuncts of an attraction which itself possesses, by its profound anatomical character, all the characteristics of a passion that will not be denied. Much may be said for this amendment of Spencer's proposition, especially in view of M. Roux's admirable description of the growth of an individual affection. He divides that growth into three stages—vague desire, crystallisation, and systematisation.

"Always, as fundamental base, we have found the *organic sexual need*, the primordial specific sensation, part and parcel of our anatomical elements. . . . Vague at first, without determinate object, this feeling soon *becomes crystallised* under a more or less definite form; stable associations are formed, desire takes bodily form, the ideal woman appears in dreams; she will soon exist in flesh and blood. Then it is that *choicc* occurs . . . the sexual need is *systematised* on an object seen athwart the dream, an object which is adorned with the ideal; love is born. Thenceforward, all associations converge towards a single point: should any physical excitant happen to awaken the sexual need, the image of the beloved one appears. Inversely, the presence of the latter, all which emanates from her, the simple recollection of her, carries the sexual need to its climax. Thus the association becomes stronger and stronger; the systematisation becomes absolute."

It is not impossible to reconcile these two views, by giving to the mere physical attraction (in which the whole body takes part) a large measure of that irresistibility which Spencer seems inclined to reserve for the compound of psychic and physiological elements. The phenomena of lust seem to show without much dubiety that the physical sexual need itself may become a master power. Prostitution, in fact, is more or less a painful tribute to the supremacy of the sex impulse in its purely physical form, for the

higher feelings are in most cases of this class conspicuous by their absence. "*Faute de mieux*" may be taken as the apologetic attitude of the male partner in this social vice. He yields to an imperious impulse, yearning the while for those subtler feelings which alone give lasting joy to the associations of the sexes.

M. Roux has a short passage bearing on this matter. He says:—

"The philosopher who lets himself be drawn by a love unworthy of him does not seek the physical pleasure, the moment of voluptuousness, the vanity of which he knows. It is not that his genital organs require to exercise their functions, too often even he deplores that the contrary should not be the case! It is the stronger impression which we have described that urges him, besieges him, and makes him incapable of working. When he lets himself go, it is not the pleasure that he seeks. It is the physical quietude which will follow."

However, the fact that the higher psychic elements in man contribute to the supremacy of sex is independent of the relative values of these elements and the primary sexual need. The important thing to note is that every human activity, from the motions of the ultimate atoms up to the most lofty functions of brain and heart, lend their aid in a common cause—that of sexual attraction. "We love," says M. Roux, "with our whole body." But to M. Roux, who is a scientific materialist, the functions of the body include the functions of the "soul." So, to use the language of orthodox dualism, body and soul are bent upon the same inflexible purpose, and not the most infinitesimal fragment of either can claim exemption from the tyrannous law of sex supremacy. "The whole of nature," says Mantegazza, in a burst of enthusiasm, "is one hymn of love." And while nature, as a whole, is not, perhaps, constructed on so exquisite a principle, human history is unquestionably a variation on that one eternal theme. Sex, according to Dr. Havelock Ellis, is the central problem of life: it is, always

has been, and always will be the key-note of life's happiness and life's misery. It is the one thing in man that will out, for good or ill. Hence the absurdity of efforts, once so conspicuous in religious life, to crush the longing in men and women for the sweetest intimacies of life, and to supplant it with a visionary ideal that kept body and soul in a state of constant and morbid hunger. Hence, too, the absurdity of attempting to shut the light of day from the mysteries of sex and taboo the open discussion of the anomalies of our sexual life. Nothing could be more chaotic than the state of modern society from the point of view of sexual intercourse. Beneath the hypocritical veils of chastity and life-long monogamy there are gathered thousands of sex associations in which lust, vice, selfishness, material interests, ignorance, weakness, indifference, passion, and love itself play their several and combined parts to the confusion of moral law and order. All this witnesses to the supremacy of sex, but it also testifies to the imperative necessity of realising the gravity of the evils which flow from misconceptions of the place of sex in nature, and particularly human nature. It testifies, moreover, to the duty of society to grapple in a spirit of sincerity and earnestness with the undoubted facts of our sex life, and to see if, by a frank acknowledgment of the miseries of things as they are, it is possible to find a path from the present chaos to a better condition of things. Society has, in the past, shirked that duty, and hypocrisy and vice have prospered. But, thanks to the unflagging efforts of a few scientific men, and to the growing dissatisfaction of a large proportion of thoughtful men and women with the sexual *status quo*, there are signs of better days. We are at least a little wiser than we were. Let us pray to the gods that we may have courage to follow where our wisdom leads.

ADAM GOWANS WHYTE, B.Sc.

INQUISITION AND AUTO DA FE AT THE DAWN OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

GREAT BRITAIN abounds in Saviours of Humanity. That is, no doubt, the sole reason why this incomparable nation is the paragon of goodness and morality.

Amongst thousands of minor prophets that are to be found in as many sects and religious denominations, General Booth, the wily founder of the Salvation Army, was considered the greatest, but the end of the nineteenth century has welcomed a greater man. The redoubtable General of the Salvation Army battles successfully with the devil, and he justly boasts of his victory over the powers of the deep, but Dr. Lionel Smith Beale fights a greater monster than his satanic majesty: "Science,"—science and the devil the enemies of mankind.

General Booth with a faithful army strives to plunder the poorest of the poor to save their souls from the clutches of Belzebub, and, alas, this business pays exceedingly well.

Dr. Beale is less mercenary, his *magnum opus* is a book entitled "Our Morality, chiefly from the Medical Side," and the English Government, conscious of the great importance of his work, pays the prophet's expenses, wherever he decides to carry his theories of medical morality into practice. Thus the English public contributes to the new crusade against the evil influence of the highly detrimental Darwinian theory and of progressive science in general.

Humanity is indebted to Dr. Lionel Smith Beale for the last grand *auto da fe* of scientific works, the first in the twentieth century.

Our readers will judge the great merit of this newest champion of English righteousness, so well known to continental sinners, from a short history of his recent exploit to suppress scientific literature which in this great man's opinion would endanger not only the immaculate morality of the "man about town" and of the Piccadilly virgin, but *horrible dictu* the morals of that most innocent class

of human beings—the Medical Profession of Great Britain and Ireland.

Dr. Beale is himself a medical man and a septuagenarian, and so he knows the wickedness of mankind in general, and the moral frailty of doctors in particular. It is said that a voice from above called him to interfere with the evil designs of some of his depraved brethren. His first attempt, as we shall observe, was crowned with success, a success unattainable in any other country but Great Britain, the home of Pecksniff and Mrs. Grundy.

And as nothing succeeds like success we may soon expect a further development of this great man's exploits before senile dementia weakens his powers which are so valuable to a government that has to watch over the incomparable morality of Her Majesty's subjects.

It was at the breakfast table when Dr. Beale received the call from above, a restless night had predisposed his nerves to a shock and his aged brain to a reaction. The bacon was tough and the eggs stale, and there next to the coffee pot, amongst letters from friends and patients, a pink cover attracts his attention; it is a list of books. With terror and dismay he sees the word *Sex* and glances at the headings. The holy ghost descends upon the moral doctor and he reads the titles aloud. What amount of wickedness in this title, *The Universal Illusion of Free Will*, and there another, *The Pathology of Emotions*; but worse than all this here: *The Psychology of Sex* and *Chapters on Human Love*.

These titles are bad enough, he soliloquised, the books themselves must be downright poison, they will do incalculable harm. It is the duty of a true Englishman and the duty of a true Christian to put a stop to this pernicious literature, which in the first instance is intended to corrupt the morals of 40,000 medical men in this kingdom. Ha, something must be done! Let us look first at the authors. Yes, yes, my worst suspicions are confirmed. *Havelock Ellis*—I know that rascal, he is of the continental school, and has done harm enough with his book, *Man and Woman*, wherein he openly deals with things that never should be touched; he is, no doubt, as depraved a man as these Frenchmen, *Féré* and *Hamon*. Oh, these French doctors are the wickedest and the most immoral of the whole human race, aiders and abettors of adultery by profession. Oh, how I hate them! There is another—*Geoffrey Mortimer*. Well, well, I am sure he is no better. Birds of a feather flock together. By God Almighty, we will crush them all! Then the illumination came, and Dr. Beale communicated his suspicions and his plans to the Treasury. He himself describes his

mission before the magistrates, who ordered the first *auto da fè* in the twentieth century as follows:—

I looked through the list of books quickly and saw several books advertised in it with a number of doubtful headings. Then I took it to the Treasury, and by them was placed in communication with the Chief Constable of Hertfordshire. He came to me some time afterwards with Superintendent Wood.

At the head of the Treasury, this important branch of the British Government, we find the author of the "Foundations of Belief," the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour. A branch of the Treasury is the office of the Public Prosecutor, and the director of this office is the Earl of Desart. But it must not be supposed that the new defender of the immaculate morals of Her Britannic Majesty's subjects actually succeeded in interesting these gentlemen in his plan of suppressing scientific literature. More probably he enlisted some subordinate at the Public Prosecutor's office in his work, and then he found in the Chief Constable of Hertfordshire an enthusiastic ally, and in the Superintendent of Police a useful tool to attain his object.

It seems remarkable, however, that the worthy doctor went to the Public Prosecutor and denounced the University Press before having even read the books, simply, as he stated himself, because he saw some doubtful headings in the publisher's list.

Advised by the police, the next step he took was to order some books with doubtful headings, and the Emeritus Professor selected those which seemed to be the most dangerous. *Darwin on Trial* and *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* seemed to belong to this category, as well as the *Universal Illusion of Free Will* and the *Pathology of Emotions*.

Without reading the books Dr. Beale laid an information before the magistrates of the county of Hertfordshire which led to the granting of a search warrant on the premises of the University Press in Watford. Under this warrant the police entered the printing works, and there seized all the books which in their opinion were apt to corrupt the morals of Her Most Gracious Majesty. Three or four vanloads full of scientific works were carted away, and an extremely difficult task fell upon the superintendent of police to decide which of the seized works were of a dangerous character so as to include them in an indictment before the county magistrates.

Poor Superintendent Wood, who with success had tackled burglars and arrested thieves in *flagrante delicto*, who may even have had a try at finding Jack the Ripper, suddenly was face to face with a new problem never before put before an English constable.

There on his office table lay the *corpus delicti*: *Psychology of Sex, Pathology of Emotions, Universal Illusion of Free Will, The Rhythm of the Pulse, and Chapters on Human Love.*

Mr. Wood had from a humble police constable advanced to the post of superintendent. As a honest policeman he had done his duty to the Queen, in the police court he had testified to the misdeeds of his fellow-countrymen, but never in his life had he heard of a *Psychology of Sex* or of a *Pathology of Emotions*. Really it was too cruel of his superiors to charge him with the examination and prosecution of these wicked books. And yet the ordeal must be faced, a summons must be issued, and the court of the county of Hertfordshire must be asked to order the grand *auto da fè* of the most dangerous literature. Thus it was ordained by the officials of the Treasury who had placed this burden on the shoulders of a police constable.

Well, he said, when the books had been piled up at the police station, let us study the most plausible one first. Hm, hm, "Chapters on Human Love." . . . The title is not so bad, there is nothing wrong in "Chapters" because the Bible is divided into chapters, and there cannot be much wrong in "Human Love." We must examine the contents to get at the truth, the poison no doubt lies hidden in the folds, perhaps the headings of the single chapters will throw some light on the character of the book. Ah, yes, here you are: "Human Sexual Selection," that sounds very suspicious; and this here: "Celibacy," "Sex Union." Certainly this book must be bad, we will put it down on the list, and I will take it home to read in bed.

"*Psychology of Sex*,"—that's the next one, two volumes. "Sex" I know has something to do with woman, but what the devil do they mean by "*Psychology*"!! It must be something very wicked, I will consult a dictionary. Here I have got it—"Psychology, the Science of the Phenomena of Mind." Well, that it not of much use to me anyhow, I will look inside the blessed book. The headings of chapters of this volume seem quite tame: *The Evolution of Modesty*, hm, hm, *The Phenomena of Periodicity, Auto-Erotism*; damn it, I don't know what that means, never in my life heard such funny words. I will glance at the first chapter. There, that seems a doubtful expression: *As a psychic secondary sexual character of the first rank it is necessary before any psychology of sex can be arranged in order, to obtain a clear view of modesty.*

Really, that is too much for me, I am afraid I must give it up.

Mr. Wood continues to read and grows more interested while con-

tinuing his study; then one hears only the exclamations of the soliloquising constable:—

A woman . . . undresses a man . . . in a bath . . .
 dear me! . . . undresses herself in his presence . . . oh,
 shocking, shocking! . . . and was not ashamed. . . .

Yes, yes, he exclaims finally, that is grossly indecent! Of course, she was not married, that's the point. We'll put it on the list and mark it "obscene," but I must take it home to study it further, it seems interesting anyhow.

So far Mr. Wood was satisfied with the result of his endeavours, but the difficulty of his task increased. Oh, cruel Dr. Beale, there is another of these wretched books.

"The Universal Illusion of Free Will." What is that? Oh, I understand that book finds an excuse for all criminals! Very suspicious headings these: *Definition of Crime, Criminal Responsibility, Free Will and Determinism.*

"Determinism"—hm, what the deuce may that mean, surely something as wicked as "Psychology"! Oh, I see the author is a Frenchman, that accounts for the character of the book! Down on the list, I need not read this book, it is sure to be full of wicked and immoral things veiled by scientific terms.

Let us look at the next one: *Pathology of Emotions*. That is rather heavy for a police-constable. "Pathology," I suppose, means: When you are ill; but what are "Emotions." I have heard that the Salvation Army have "Emotions." What does the dictionary say? Here it is: *Emotion is an agitated or aroused and usually pleasurable or painful, state of mind directed toward some object.* Hm, hm, I suppose that "object" is a woman, and if I am not mistaken I may translate "Pathology of Emotions" somewhat like this: "A pleasurable state of mind at the sight of a woman." That book must be indecent or obscene, besides it is written by a Frenchman, but to be sure I will read the preface. (Reading)—*Herbert Spencer divides states of consciousness into states of consciousness which proceed from the centre or emotions. . . .*

Ha, ha, there you are! Emotions proceed from the centre. Certainly then these things must be indecent. I need not read any further; probably this book is the worst of the lot, only I do not understand the professional terms.

Then, after a superhuman effort to decipher some of the chapters in Féré's *Pathology of Emotions* and in Hamon's *Universal Illusion of Free Will*, the superintendent of police quietly enjoyed the reading of the more congenial *Chapters on Human Love* and the *Evolution of Modesty*.

After all, he thought, these are not so bad, quite interesting indeed, and so true to nature, but yes . . . they are indecent. About these things one must not write. And, besides, if the great men of the Treasury have decreed that these books must be destroyed because they corrupt our morals, what could a superintendent of police do but obey. Yet it is rather a pity to burn these books, they contain such a lot of information one cannot find in the *Family Herald* or in the *Windsor Magazine*.

The result of Superintendent Wood's examination of the books, seized at the premises of the publishers, was the following summons:—

“In the County of Hertford,

“Petty Sessional Division of Watford

“To Chas. M. Coleman of the Parish of Watford Urban in the County of Hertford.

“WHEREAS information on oath has this day been laid before us the undersigned by William Wood of the Parish of Watford Urban in the County of Hertford Superintendent of Police for that the said William Wood did on the Eighteenth Day of December in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine under and by virtue of our special warrant in that behalf granted pursuant to the Obscene Publication Act 1857 duly enter the house situate number one in the Sotheron Road in the Parish of Watford Urban in the said County otherwise known as the University Press of which said house you were then the occupier and then and there found and seized certain obscene books and pamphlets called the *Pathology of Emotions*, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex Vol. I., and II., Chapters on Human Love, The Old and the New Ideal, The University Magazine, The Universal Illusion of Free Will, Pseudo-Philosophy, The Rhythm of the Pulse*, kept there for the purpose of sale and gain which books have been duly brought before us.

“You are therefore hereby summoned to appear before the Court of Summary Jurisdiction sitting at the Court House Watford in the said County on Saturday the Twenty-third Day of December 1899 at the hour of eleven o'clock in the forenoon to show cause why the said books and pamphlets found and seized as aforesaid shall not be destroyed.

“Dated the Twenty-first Day of December one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine.”

(Signed)

“JOSCELINE F. WATKINS,

“F. SUMNER KNYVETT,

“Justices of Peace for the County aforesaid.”

And the day arrived when the tribunal of inquisition assembled at the Watford court to decide the fate of the seized books. Mr. J. F. Watkins, J.P., acted as Grand Inquisitor; he was assisted by F. S. Knyvett, Esq., and R. W. Henderson, Esq., two county magistrates. Mr. H. Morten Turner was the prosecutor representing the police. After reading selected passages from the indicted works, he addressed the modern Court of Inquisition as follows:—

I have already submitted to the Bench paragraphs in the four volumes or books sufficient to justify my application to have these books destroyed on the ground that they are obscene. The Bench, acting as a jury to that extent, have read those passages, and having done so there can be no doubt that these books are obscene within the meaning of the definition of the Lord Chief Justice Cockburn. But to proceed on another ground—these persons, publishers, editors, and authors are anxious to upset the laws of our beloved country. These books are undoubtedly subversive of the English law of morality.

I shall now call before you Dr. Beale. He is an eminent physician of great standing in London, and has devoted his time for many years to giving instruction in scientific matters, and he will say that the publication of these works is not justified either on medical or scientific grounds. If you are satisfied with that evidence, and on those grounds, then I have no doubt that you will order the destruction of the books.

SUPERINTENDENT WOOD then gave his evidence as on the previous occasion—that he went to the University Press on December 16th, having a search warrant, and there saw the foreman. In his presence he searched the premises and seized, or took possession of, a large stock of books—four loads. I afterwards received a summons and served it at the said premises.

Then the witness for the crown, Dr. Lionel Smith Beale, appeared on the scene; he was the only witness for the prosecution, spy and informer all rolled into one important personality.

MR. H. M. TURNER, bowing to the great expert in English morality, addressed him as follows: Dr. Beale, what are your qualifications?

DR. BEALE: I am proud to say I am a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, a Bachelor of Medicine, a fellow of the Royal Society, an emeritus professor of Kings College, and also a consulting physician in Kings College Hospital. Besides I am a medical referee and adviser to the Government.

A VOICE IN COURT: And a great hypocrite.

H. M. TURNER: I think you have had some experience in teaching medical science.

DR. BEALE: Yes, I have been teaching physiology and anatomy for nearly half a century, and with great success I believe.

H. M. TURNER: Did you receive this document (producing the list of books published by the University Press) by post?

DR. BEALE: Yes, that is the one I received; it contains many books with doubtful headings.

H. M. TURNER: And what did you do with this list of publications?

DR. BEALE: I looked through it quickly, and saw several books advertised in it with a number of doubtful headings. Then I took it to the Treasury, and by them was placed in communication with the Chief Constable of Hertfordshire. He came to me some time afterwards with Superintendent Wood.

H. M. TURNER: In consequence of these communications what did you do?

DR. BEALE: I wrote to the University Press, Watford, for two books on December 4th. I sent a post card.

H. M. TURNER: Did you receive the books?

DR. BEALE: Yes, I did.

H. M. TURNER: And have you carefully perused these works?

DR. BEALE: Not very carefully. I have read parts here and there, but I cannot say that I have read it carefully.

H. M. TURNER: Putting it generally to you, and speaking as a physician, what is your opinion of these books? Are they or are they not obscene?

DR. BEALE: I consider the paragraphs that I have read as very obscene and indecent.

H. M. TURNER: Are they necessary or useful to medical students?

DR. BEALE: Certainly not, but highly dangerous. I am sure that no lecturer would read those shocking paragraphs or place these books into the hands of students in England or Great Britain.

H. M. TURNER: What about France and Germany?

DR. BEALE: Oh, they have quite a different standard of morality there, you know. We English are a moral nation, but France and Germany are rotten to the core.

MR. H. M. TURNER then called the witness's attention to a number of passages which the learned doctor unhesitatingly declared to be highly indecent, obscene, and unnecessary.

Counsel for the defence then rose and tried to shake the evidence of this witness by cross-examination, but his task, in view of the

great innate prejudice of the magistrates, nourished by the testimony of a medical witness, was hopeless from the beginning. Mr. R. H. HUMPHREYS acted as the legal representative of the University Press.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: First of all, Dr. Beale, may I ask you if you went to the police denouncing these books before you had read any of them?

DR. BEALE: Yes, I did because the titles were very doubtful, and I knew the name of Havelock Ellis as the author of highly indecent works; indeed he gloried in praising Casanova, the vilest writer on eighteenth century morals in a book called "Affirmations."

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Was that the reason why you denounced these books to the police as obscene before having read them?

DR. BEALE: Yes, partly that, and partly the titles and heading of chapters given in the prospectus.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Do you consider "Studies in the Psychology of Sex" and "Chapters on Human Love" indecent titles?

DR. BEALE: Yes I do, they are highly suggestive.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Suggestive of what?

DR. BEALE: Of indecency. (Laughter in court.)

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Well, Dr. Beale, are there such cases as described by Dr. Ellis in his *Studies*, or are there not?

DR. BEALE: Yes, there are such cases, no doubt, in schools, factories, lunatic asylums, and hospitals.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Such cases having an existence, why do you consider it wrong to put medical men and teachers in a position to notice effects and their cause and to suggest a remedy?

DR. BEALE: We medical men are already in possession of all the facts, and we do not want any more teaching on the subject.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: That is your individual view, and you should not express it on behalf of a great profession. How did you come to know the facts as to sexual inversion, if not from books? Is it inherited wisdom by which you are cognisant of these obscure vices and diseases of body and mind?

DR. BEALE: Experience in hospitals and private practice teaches us, we do not want books on these subjects.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: As all diseases will come under the observation of medical men in hospitals and private practice, is it your opinion that all reports of medical cases are superfluous or unnecessary?

DR. BEALE: If they refer to sexual matter they are not only unnecessary but even dangerous. Medical men better study other

branches of medicine, and do not lose their valuable time with such a dangerous subject as the so-called *Psychology of Sex*.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: But if certain vices exist in schools, would it not be well that teachers should be in possession of the facts?

DR. BEALE: No, it is best to ignore them.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Would you ignore the cases of syphilis because they are the result of sexual intercourse?

DR. BEALE: Yes I would, it would be best if people undergo the just punishment sent by God Almighty for their misdeeds to the full extent.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: What if they are innocent, like the wife of a debauchee?

DR. BEALE: I would treat such a case, it is an exception from the rule.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: But to treat it medically you would require knowledge of the remedies and treatment. How could that be obtained if no books existed dealing with and describing the cases?

DR. BEALE (*confused*): That is my secret, it has nothing to do with this case.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: That is not a fair answer. Will you tell the magistrates what "Psychology of Sex" means?

DR. BEALE: It means nothing, there is no "Psychology of Sex." Everything connected with or relating to Sex is of vile origin, it is sin. Indeed the word "Sex" should be banished from our language.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: That is the ostrich's policy. Have you read Darwin's great work on *Sexual Selection*?

DR. BEALE: No, I would not touch it, it is poison to the mind of the pure.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: How can you say that if you have not read the book?

DR. BEALE: I know that everything connected with Sex is dangerous, pernicious to body and mind, and I know that Darwin's works have done much mischief.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: That is your opinion, but do you not, like all human beings, own your existence to the much maligned sexual act?

DR. BEALE: I am sorry to say I do, but my parents were married.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Oh, I see! You assume that these "Studies in the Psychology of Sex" deal with the subject without reference to marriage, and that "Chapters on Human Love" deal with illicit love only?

DR. BEALE: Yes I do, and that makes them doubly objectionable.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: But could you imagine a sexless world? Could you imagine the existence of a maminal without the preceding sexual union of the parents, married or not married?

DR. BEALE: Yes I could; Adam was created without that cursed act, and Eve and the angels and . . . Christ.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: You have not heard of a more recent case I suppose?

DR. BEALE: No, but that is the result of original sin and the loss of paradise.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Under the circumstances I am afraid I shall not be able to shake your conviction. Have you read any reviews of these books?

DR. BEALE: No, I have not, and if I had they would not influence or modify my opinion.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Then your opinion is adverse to that of the majority of the medical profession?

DR. BEALE: Perhaps it is.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Here is Dr. Savage, of Guy's Hospital, and Dr. Nassau, of Westminster Hospital, and Dr. Gull, and many others who differ from you as to the value of the work for teachers. Do you know a work by Professor Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, which in a sense is the foundation of Dr. Ellis's *Psychology of Sex*?

DR. BEALE: Yes, the foundation is a very poor one, and *Psychopathia Sexualis* is a disgrace to Christianity and to Christian morals. That book should be burned with the rest.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: You have written a book, "Our Morality and the Moral Question,"—chiefly from the medical side—and from this book I gather that you are a specialist in medical morality. Are you aware that this your work has exposed you to the ridicule and laughter of the entire medical profession? Shall I read some criticism of this book of yours?

DR. BEALE: I do not care a straw what the medical profession and less what medical journals say about me or my writings. You can save yourself the trouble of reading these reviews and attacks.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: In your book on medical morals you devote a chapter to "Moral Christianity" and another to "Immoral Literature," which means medical works dealing with the sex problem. In this chapter you say: "All that is needed seems to be a committee of half a dozen well known persons in whose judgment and discrimination and sense of justice the public would have full confidence, *but from whose decision there should be no appeal.* Such a committee should be instructed to condemn anything which en-

couraged immorality upon the same principle that the performance of indecent plays is not permitted." I see that you attach great importance to the question that there should be no appeal from the decision of this committee of six censors of medical morals, but do you really believe that even in moral England you could find besides yourself five medical authorities of standing and reputation who would condemn books like these of Ellis, Féré, and Krafft-Ebing?

DR. BEALE: Oh yes, I do.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: And why are you afraid of an appeal against the decision of this proposed committee of six?

DR. BEALE: Because it is important that the decision of moral men should not be reversed by the immoral.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: Then you assume that the majority of medical authorities is immoral?

DR. BEALE: That may be the case.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: One more question. Why do you consider the work by Professor A. Hamon, *The Universal Illusion of Free Will*, an immoral book?

DR. BEALE: Because the existence of free will is the basis of our holy religion and the basis of morals in general. The denial of Free Will is the most dangerous doctrine ever propounded, it destroys the moral edifice built up by Christianity during nineteen centuries.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: No matter whether this dangerous doctrine is the correct one or not you consider it immoral?

DR. BEALE: That is so.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: And if science discovers a truth, you think it should be suppressed if it is dangerous to the tenets of religion and of religious morality?

DR. BEALE: Knowledge is often more dangerous than ignorance.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: In this respect you defend the standpoint of the persecutors of Galileo Galilei and of Giordano Bruno?

DR. BEALE: They have nothing to do with these immoral books.

R. H. HUMPHREYS: No, of course not. I have no further questions to ask this witness.

H. M. TURNER: Then, sir, this is the case for the prosecution in support of the summons.

R. H. HUMPHREYS (addressing the magistrates for the defence): Gentlemen, I know that your task is a difficult one—to decide a question of this kind—a question which should be decided by eminent members of the medical profession, but my task is even more difficult. It is not for me to put forward my opinion with

regard to these works, which have been accepted by the whole scientific world as a valuable contribution to the study of psychology, but I will lay before you the opinions of medical authorities, of medical men and men of science who are able and truly competent judges of works of this kind, who can say which books are of importance and of necessity and whether any subject has been treated in a scientific spirit. I must, however, first of all call your attention to the fact that the prosecution has not produced a single witness whose morals have been or could have been corrupted by these works. The only witness called by the prosecution is the informer in this case, Dr. Beale, who in the medical profession is known as a faddist full of strange prejudices, who considers himself to have a special mission from the deity to save English morality from corruption. The books have not been offered to the public but only to the medical and legal professions.

That these works are scientific in the truest sense of the word no one can doubt who is cognisant of the great eminence in the medical profession of Dr. Féré, the chief physician of the Bicêtre Hospital, and Dr. H. Ellis, the well known author of *Man and Woman*, and also of A. Hamon, who is a professor in the New University of Brussels.

Now as to the legitimacy of scientific publications on the physiology and psychology of sex I may first of all cite the words of one of the greatest anatomists and physiologists of the eighteenth century, Dr. Albrecht von Haller. "There are no secrets in physiology, and the function of reproduction is the most important of all bodily functions, a legitimate object of study not only for the medical man, but for theologians, moralists, naturalists, and legislators."

All the medical authorities, including Harvey and Turner, the pride of every Englishman, agree with this candid opinion. Indeed moral and legal authors of all ages have adopted this standpoint, and Lord Denman, one of the greatest of England's judges, in his judicial capacity on a similar case declared half a century ago that the subject was most important whenever expounded by medical authority and in a scientific spirit.

That the mock-modest, hypocritical and pharasiacal amongst us are of a different opinion, should serve rather as a warning to avoid the terrible mistake of suppressing facts, the knowledge of which is of the greatest importance to mankind.

Fifteen hundred years ago St. Augustine discussing the same important subject said: "If what I have written should scandalise any prurient minded person, let him lay the blame rather on his own

shamelessness, than on the words I have been obliged to use in order to express my thought."

This opinion has prevailed ever since amongst all right minded men, and I could adduce the views of many more of the greatest teachers of Christianity. But I will limit my remarks to the case before you. I will cite professional men of our times, philosophers and theologians, and last not least the illustrious authors of these very books to demonstrate their earnestness and sincerity and the legitimacy of the subject with which the same deal.

Herbert Spencer, our greatest philosopher, says: "Whoever hesitates to utter that which he thinks the highest truth lest it should be too much in advance of the time, may reassure himself by looking at his acts from an impersonal point of view."

This impersonal point of view we should adopt. May I remind you of Wordsworth's verse:—

"The eye—it cannot choose but see,
We cannot bid the ear be still;
Our bodies feel, where'r they be
Against or with our will."

It is no use closing our eyes and ears and to adopt the ostrich's proverbial policy. You will find that Robert Buchanan is right when he says, "Is not the record of every generation filled with the name of books labelled vicious by the contemporary majority and afterwards pronounced soul-helping by the verdict of posterity. The suppressed books form in themselves a bible of humanity."

But I must not deviate too much from the important subject which requires our immediate attention.

One of the books which the prosecution asks you to-day to condemn and to destroy has been the object of an inquisition and prosecution in 1898; it is Havelock Ellis's *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*. Then the prosecution was not persisted in because the opinion expressed by the scientific world was clearly against the suppression of scientific publications of this kind. And before I place before you the opinion of medical authorities I will show the spirit of the author and the sincerity of his intentions which, I think, should weigh in judging his work. The author of the indicted book, a medical man of high repute, in a well known book under the title, *Man and Woman: A Study of Human Secondary Sexual Characters*, has put forward an introduction to the study of the primary questions of sexual psychology, and in the work before you, which is stated to be dangerous to public morals, he simply lays before the scientific world part of the result of his studies and

observations, he tries to explain the problem of sex, shrouded in mystery for so many centuries.

I will read to you what Dr. Havelock Ellis himself says about the question that has been laid before you, that is, whether the publication of scientific books on the sex problem is legitimate and necessary. Here are his own words:—

“In this particular field the evil of ignorance is magnified by our efforts to suppress that which never can be suppressed, though in the effort of suppression it may become perverted. I have at least tried to find out what are the facts, among normal people as well as among abnormal people; for, while it seems to me that the physician’s training is necessary in order to ascertain the facts, the physician for the most part only obtains the abnormal facts, which alone bring little light. I have tried to get at the facts, and, having got at the facts, to look them simply and squarely in the face. If I cannot perhaps turn the lock myself, I bring the key which can alone in the end rightly open the door; the key of sincerity. That is my own panacea: sincerity.

“I know many of my friends, people on whose side I, too, am to be found, retort with another word: reticence. It is a mistake, they say, to try to uncover these things; leave the sexual instincts alone, to grow up and develop in the shy solitude they love, and they will be sure to grow up and develop wholesomely. But, as a matter of fact, that is precisely what we cannot and will not ever allow them to do. There are very few middle-aged men and women who can clearly recall the facts of their lives and tell you in all honesty that their sexual instincts have developed easily and wholesomely throughout. And it should not be difficult to see why this is so. Let my friends try to transfer their feelings and theories from the reproductive region to, let us say, the nutritive region, the only other which can be compared to it for importance. Suppose that eating and drinking were never spoken of openly, save in veiled or poetic language, and that no one ever ate food publicly, because it was considered immoral and immodest to reveal the mysteries of this natural function. We know what would occur. A considerable proportion of the community, more especially the more youthful members, possessed by an instinctive and legitimate curiosity, would concentrate their thoughts on the subject. They would have so many problems to puzzle over: How often ought I to eat? What ought I to eat? Is it wrong to eat fruit, which I like? Ought I to eat grass, which I don’t like? Instinct notwithstanding, we may be quite sure that only a small minority would succeed in eating

reasonably and wholesomely. The sexual secrecy of life is even more disastrous than such a nutritive secrecy would be; partly because we expend such a wealth of moral energy in directing and misdirecting it, partly because the sexual impulse normally develops at the same time as the intellectual impulse, not in the early years of life, when wholesome instinctive habits might be formed. And there is always some ignorant and foolish friend who is prepared still further to muddle things: Eat a meal every other day! Eat twelve meals a day! Never eat fruit! Always eat grass! The advice emphatically given in sexual matters is usually not less absurd than this. When, however, the matter is fully open, the problems of food are not, indeed, wholly solved, but everyone is enabled by the experience of his fellows to reach some sort of solution suited to his own case. And when the rigid secrecy is once swept away a sane and natural reticence becomes for the first time possible.

"This secrecy has not always been maintained. When the Catholic Church was at the summit of its power and influence it fully realised the magnitude of sexual problems, and took an active and inquiring interest in all the details of normal and abnormal sexuality. Even to the present time there are certain phenomena of the sexual life which have scarcely been accurately described except in ancient theological treatises. As the type of such treatises I will mention the great tome of Sanchez, *De Matrimonio*. Here you will find the whole sexual life of men and women analysed in its relationship to sin. Everything is set forth, as clearly and as concisely as it can be—without morbid prudery on the one hand, or morbid sentimentality on the other—in the coldest scientific language; the right course of action is pointed out for all the cases that may occur, and we are told what is lawful, what a venial sin, what a mortal sin. Now I do not consider that sexual matters concern the theologian alone, and I deny altogether that he is competent to deal with them. In his hands, also, undoubtedly, they sometimes become prurient, as they can scarcely fail to become on the non-natural and unwholesome basis of asceticism, and as they with difficulty become in the open-air light of science. But we are bound to recognise the thoroughness with which the Catholic theologians dealt with these matters, and, from their own point of view, indeed, the entire reasonableness; we are bound to recognise the admirable spirit in which, successfully or not, they sought to approach them. We need to-day the same spirit and temper applied from a different standpoint. These things concern everyone; the study of these things concerns the physiologist, the psychologist, the moralist. We want to get into possession of the actual facts, and

from the investigation of the facts we want to ascertain what is normal and what is abnormal, from the point of view of physiology and of psychology. We want to know what is naturally lawful under the various sexual chances that may befall man, not as the born child of sin, but as a naturally social animal, what is a venial sin against nature, what a mortal sin against nature. The answers are less easy to reach than the theologian's answers generally were, but we can at least put ourselves in the right attitude; we may succeed in asking that question which is sometimes even more than the half of knowledge.

"It is perhaps a mistake to show so plainly at the outset that I approach what may seem only a psychological question not without moral fervour. But I do not wish any mistake to be made. I regard sex as the central problem of life. And now that the problem of religion has practically been settled, and that the problem of labour has at least been placed on a practical foundation, the question of sex—with the racial questions that rest on it—stands before the coming generations as the chief problem for solution. Sex lies at the root of life, and we can never learn to reverence life until we know how to understand sex."

Here indeed you have the case for the defence better and clearer expressed than a lawyer could state it: *Sex is the central problem of life*, and therefore its phases should be explored by scientific men. Who could object to this plain and reasonable view, which, as I have said, has been adopted by the whole of the scientific world, and which is ignored only by prejudiced men of the type of Dr. Beale.

As you have thus heard the author on his own defence I will record a few professional opinions confirming his view, and proving that Dr. H. Ellis's work is considered to be written in the true scientific spirit which elevates it high above so-called erotic literature which we justly abhor and condemn.

Dr. Conolly Norman, the medical superintendent of the Richmond Asylum, says:—

"In its relation to insanity, to degeneration, and to the neurotic state, the subject of sexual inversion has much medical interest; in its relation to crime it has much medico-legal interest. It is, therefore, a matter which must be discussed and written about."

Mr. Clark Bell, LL.D., editor of the *Medico-Legal Journal* and secretary to the Medico-Legal Society of New York, says:—

"DEAR HAVELOCK ELLIS,—I learn with mortification and regret that an attempt has been made to bring a charge of 'publishing an

obsceno libel' against a bookseller who sold your *Sexual Inversion*. The book is purely scientific and could have had no other possible intention than the completion of your admirable system of works, of which it forms an interesting and most necessary part. The group of works which you have contributed to psychological literature has, as a whole, greatly added to the lustre of your name, not alone in the Medico-Legal Society but among the savants of the whole world, who will certainly sustain you by their sympathy, should any attempt be made to impugn your professional or literary honour by officers of the law who very possibly cannot be made to look at your conduct and motives properly."

Medicine, a well-known medical journal:—

"A clear, logical, chaste analysis of the phenomena of sexual inversion, of decided scientific value. It is free from the faults which mar so many otherwise valuable works on the subject. The present volume is the first of a series of studies on sex, important alike to the physician, the biologist, and the sociologist. The volume as a whole merits perusal by its judicial tone, its clear style, its freedom alike from prurient prudery and sentimental cant, and its scientific accuracy."

The Alienist and Neurologist, a professional journal of high standing, expresses its opinion on the subject in the following words:—

"The book will interest and instruct all clinical psychiatrists and all physicians of extensive observation and practice. The medico-legal student, the lawyer, the psychologist and jurist will likewise find instruction in this work. It presents singular phases in the morbid sexual life of the *genus homo*. The book has a professional and social interest which cannot be ignored, and medico-legal aspects as well as medical phases which demand professional and philanthropic attention from medical men, medico-legalist and moralist alike."

Let me also cite a continental editor of repute in the well-known *Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie*:—

"The author, who has already acquired fame by his *Man and Woman* and *Criminal* . . . has produced a work which is in the highest degree worthy to attract every psychologist and alienist. Its chief service lies less in the cases, which are comparatively few, than in its psychological depth, the historical and scientific grasp of a difficult subject, together with the clear and original presentation of the many problems involved. Certainly no books which have yet appeared render this one superfluous; it may be said,

rather, to complement them in the happiest manner, and may be most earnestly recommended. The author rightly points out in the Preface the gravity of the question of sexual inversion from the social standpoint."

And here you have the *Lancet*, the principal medical journal in Great Britain:—

"What constitutes indecent literature? Is a book indecent because it deals with an indecent subject? Surely there is no reasonable person who will say 'Yes.' A book written solely in a spirit of scientific inquiry into a subject which, though odious in itself, has yet to be faced cannot possibly be included under the head of indecent literature."

I could *ad indefinitum* multiply the recitation of opinions of professional men, but I will abstain from protracting this inquiry. Only let me state what Charles Féré, whose work, *The Pathology of Emotions*, has also been seized, says on the subject:—

"Ignorance is the soil which is most favourable to the development of vice."

And it is indeed the opinion of all the medical authorities that perversion and vice is greatly fostered by the mystery in which sex questions are shrouded. The ignorance of doctors and teachers on the vital subject of sexual anomalies is considered a grave danger, and it is our duty not to increase this danger by suppressing scientific works on the subject. In every other country of Europe a prosecution of this kind would be an impossibility, and I hope I shall not in vain appeal to your sense of right and common sense, when I ask you to dismiss the summons and to return the books to the publishers.

Counsel then referred at length to the other books seized on the premises of the University Press, and described the seizure of books like Féré's *Pathology of Emotions* and A. Hamon's *Illusion of Free Will* as highly absurd.

He pleaded in vain, and the Court of Inquisition made the order for the destruction of the books, and the same were burned in the year of grace nineteen hundred by the chief constable of the county of Hertfordshire.